UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,998	04/21/2004	Shmuel Shaffer	062891.1250	5499

5073 7590 05/04/2009

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
2001 ROSS AVENUE
SUITE 600
DALLAS, TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, KHAI N	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2614	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/04/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptomail1@bakerbotts.com
glenda.orrantia@bakerbotts.com

Continuation of 11.

Applicant's requests for reconsideration filed on April 7, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the Art Rejection for claims 1-2, 4-6, 8, 11-12, 14-16, 18, and 32 (noted that the Applicant's Remarks did not listed claim 5, i.e., listed claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 11, 14-16, 18, and 32 - See Applicant's Remarks page 11 lines 4), Applicant argues that the reference Bushnell et al. (U.S. Publication Number 2005/0113077 hereinafter "Bushnell") fails to disclose about the communication of the status of each of the users in a Call Pick Up Group to one or more endpoints of the users in this Call Pick Up Group for display to the users (See Applicant's Remarks page 11 lines 26-28).

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant's argument because Bushnell clearly discloses the communication of the status of each of the users in a Call Pick Up Group to one or more endpoints of the users in this Call Pick Up Group for display to the users. Bushnell invention is "to enable a user and network elements to know the status and availability of another user to thereby improve communication efficiency" (See Bushnell – paragraph [0023], lines 1-4), and monitoring the status and availability of any types of user device, including wireless telephones, Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) devices, traditional telephones, multimedia devices, etc., (See Bushnell - paragraph [0023], lines 8-11), and extended to laptop computers, Instant Messaging Clients or IP Softphones (See Bushnell – paragraph [0023], lines 22-25).

Bushnell further discloses that Call Pick Up Group service allows multiple employees to answer each others calls by clicking Pickup icon on the IP phone (See Bushnell – paragraph [0039], lines 1-7), and the Call Pick Up Group waiting call notification can be delivered by instant messages (See Bushnell – paragraph [0039], lines 11-15). Therefore, Bushnell anticipates claims 1-2, 4-6, 8, 11-12, 14-16, 18, and 32, and the rejection is proper and maintainable.

Regarding the Art Rejection for claims 7, 9-10, 17, and 19-31, for the same reasons set forth above, claims 7, 9-10, 17, and 19-31 are rejected as being unpatentable over Bushnell in view of McMurry et al. (U.S. Publication 2004/0086102), and the rejection is proper and maintainable.

Regarding the Art Rejection for claims 3 and 13, for the same reasons set forth above, claims 7, 9-10, 17, and 19-31 are rejected as being unpatentable over Bushnell in view of Ardon (U.S. Patent 5,371,781), and the rejection is proper and maintainable.

In addition, The Examiner would like to emphasize for the record that the claims' language is broad, and the Applicant has not argued any narrower interpretation of the claim limitations nor amended the claims significantly enough to construe a narrower meaning to the limitations.

Since the claims breadth allows multiple interpretations and meanings, which are broader than Applicant's disclosure, the Examiner is required to interpret the claim

limitations in terms of their broadest reasonable interpretations while determining patentability of the disclosed invention. See MPEP 2111. In other words, the claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification and the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach. See *In re Hyatt*, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000), *In re Cortright*, 165 F.3d 1353, 1359, 49 USPQ2d 1464, 1468 (Fed. Cir. 1999), and *In re American Academy of Science Tech Center*, 2004 WL 1067528 (Fed. Cir. May 13, 2004). Any term that is not clearly defined in the specification must be given its plain meaning as understood by one of ordinary skill in the art. See MPEP 2111.01. See also *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 321, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989), *Sunrace Roots Enter Co. v. SRAM Corp.*, 336 F.3d 1298, 1302, 67 USPQ2d 1438, 1441 (Fed. Cir. 2003), *Brookhill- Wilk 1, LLC v. Intuitive Surgical, Inc.*, 334 F.3d 1294, 1298 67 USPQ2d 1132, 1136 (Fed. Cir.2003).

The interpretation of the claims by their broadest reasonable interpretation reduces the possibility that, once the claims are issued, the claims are interpreted more broadly than justified. See *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-551 (CCPA 1969).

Also, limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir.1993).

Therefore, the failure to significantly narrow definition or scope of the claims and supply arguments commensurate in scope with the claims implies the Applicant intends broad interpretation be given to the claims.

Again, the Examiner has interpreted the claims broadly.

Khai N. Nguyen
(571) 270-3141

/Ahmad F Matar/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2614